Document 50-2 Filed 06/26/2006 Page 2 of 22 ALL PROFESSIONAL STAFF SHOULD DISPLAY MATURITY The following chieria are guidelined for consideration:

ALL PROFESSIONAL STAFF SHOULD GIVE ADEQUATE ATTENTION TO PERSONAL

Case 1:05-cv-00126-SJM

eacher's Comments: Ut extra comment area is needed, please attach en additional shee

OVERALL EVALUATION:

Satisfactory

Lette & mitchell Signature of Teacher

PROFESSIONAL EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Philosophy and Remonate Section.
Claudettte Mitchell

10-12

Meadville

Area

Language one S - Satisfactory

SHOULD DEMONSTRATE ABILITY: TO PREPARE, PLAN AND USE EFFECTIVELY INSTRUCTIONAL

LESSONS

PROFESSIONAL STAFF SHOULD DEMONSTRATE THE ABILITY ಠ USE APPROPRIATE TEACHING TO ENHANCE TEACHER

Uses a variety of instructional methods Uses auditory and visual aids purposefully.

ALL PROFESSIONAL STAFF SHOULD ENCOURAGE POSITIVE TEACHER - STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS he following criteria are guidelinus for consideration:

Encourages the development of

Encourages the student in the planning classroom activities. triendiness and a feeling of mutual art shows no favoritism or partialty.

B. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND TRAITS

Case 1:05-cv-00126-SJM

ALL PROFESSIONAL STAFF SHOULD BE ABLE TO RESPOND EFFECTIVELY TO SUPERVISION

The following or teria are guidelines for consideration:

Demonstrates ability to work with administrators to achieve inducational impro-

ALL PROFESSIONAL STAFF SHOULD DISPLAY POSITIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD ACHIEVING EDUCATIONAL GOALS

The following criteria are guidelines for consideration:

Displays interest.

Filed 06/26/2006

Page 4 of 22

The following chieria are guidelines for consideration:

Maintains sounds relationships and works constructively with students, parents and school personnel

STAFF SHOULD DEMONSTRATE THE ABILITY TO COOPERATE WITH OTHERS

Carries out exira duty assignments regularly.

The following criteria are guidelines for consideration: ALL PROFESSIONAL STAFF SHOULD DISPLAY MATURITY

Demonstrates honesty Demonstrates self-confidence and a pleasant disposition lowerd students. Exhibits intelligent.

ALL PROFESSIONAL STAFF SHOULD BE DEPENDABLE

The fellowing criteria are guidelines for consideration: is responsible in meeting education coligations in be relied upon to take some initiative which may arise.

ALL PROFESSIONAL STAFF SHOULD DEMONSTRATE THE ABILITY TO COMMUNICATE EFFECTIVELY

The following criteria are guidelines for consideration: Cempostrates appropriate use of language and voice control

Gives crear and concise instructional directions

Document 50-2

ALL PROFESSIONAL STAFF SHOULD GIVE ADEQUATE ATTENTION TO PERSONAL AND PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

The following criteria are guidelines for consideration:

Gives adequate attention to personal grooming and appropriate dress.
Is physically fit as evidenced by regular attendance, and the ability to carry a normal assignment. (This does not apply to temporary disabilities)

Case 1:05-cv-00126-SJM

ALL STAFF SHOULD STRIVE FOR CONTINUED PROFESSIONAL GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES

The following criteria are guidelines for consideration:

Sinves to attend workshops, seminars, etc. to provide for professional growth is an active member in professional organizations

Lit extra

OVERALL EVALUATION have read this report and discussed it with my

IN THE MATTER OF ARBITRATION

たて 10-6603

Q7 . KD

734 5286

EXHIBIT

between

CRAWFORD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

CRAWFORD CENTRAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

IECEINEN AUG 11 9 1495

DECISION IN

Grievance No. 2-94-95

Teacher Evaluation Claudette Mitchell

GRIEVANCE

The grievance asserts that the District did not have just cause to rate the Grievant unsatisfactorily for the 1993-1994 school year.

AWARD:

The grievance is sustained

February 24, 1995; Meadville, Pennsylvania

APPEARANCES

For the District

Emil M. Spadafore, Jr., Solicitor to

Crawford Central James C. LaScola, Superintendent, CCSD Michael E. Dolecki, Assistant Superintendent,

George H. Deshner, Principal, Meadville Sr. High Richard S. Curry, English Teacher CCSD

For the Association

John P. Jones, PSEA Staff Attorney Richard Zylak, CCEA President Pat Deardorff, Grievance Chairperson Claudette Mitchell, Grievant

RT4 734 DZB

F. 153

חצר זה כממה מש. כם

<u>ADMINISTRATION</u>

Parties to hear and decide a matter then in dispute between them. A hearing went torward on February 24, 1995, where both Parties presented testimony, written evidence whersupon the record was closed. The matter is now ready for final disposition. and testified in his own behalf. Post Hearing Briefs were duly filed and exchanged and arguments in support of their respective positions and where the Grievant appeared By letter of February 8, 1995, the undersigned was notified of his selection by the

GRIEVANCE AND QUESTION TO BE RESOLVED

On June 27, 1994, the following Grievance (Joint Exhibit-2) was filed:

Nature of Grievance That the principal has violated the contractual and legal rights of the grievant by having improperly observed and rated her unsatisfactory for the 1993-94 school year

without just cause.

the contractual and legal rights of the grievant. That the unsatisfactory rating and any other related material be removed Relief Sought. That the principal cease and desist from violating from her file and destroyed and changed to a satisfactory rating, and any other relief the arbitrator may deem appropriate.

unsatisfactory rating. question to be resolved is was there just cause ರ SSUe 듉 Grievant an

Grievance No. 2-94-95

93:26

PSEA

PERTINENT PORTIONS OF THE AGREEMENT

The following portions of the Agreement (Joint Exhibit-1) are pertinent:

ARTICLE III

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

Definitions

.

Grievance

A "grievance" is hereby defined as:

 a claim by an employee or employees regarding the meaning, interpretation or application of any provision in this Agreement.

ARTICLE IV

RIGHTS OF PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES

A. Just Cause Provision

No professional employee shall be disciplined, reprimanded, reduced in rank or compensation or deprived of any professional advantage without just cause. Any such action asserted by the Board or any agent or representative thereof, shall be subject to the grievance procedure herein set forth. The reasons forming the basis for disciplinary action will be made available to the professional employees and the Association promptly.

ARTICLE XII

EMPLOYEE EVALUATION

General Criteria

>

Basis for Conducting Evaluations

Evaluations shall be conducted under the provisions of Section 1123 of the School Code and the School District

Grievance No. 2-94-95

CAA2_CAT_134 ,

17:50

Policy governing the use of Appendix A of the Professional Evaluation instrument.

Observation Reports

An employee shall be given a copy of any written observation report. No such report shall be submitted to the central office, placed in the employee's file, or otherwise acted upon without prior review by the employee. The employee shall acknowledge that he/she has had the opportunity to review such material by affixing his/her signature to the copy to be filed with the express understanding that such signatures in no way indicate agreement with the contents of the report.

Rating Reports

The employee shall receive a copy of all rating reports prior to said forms being placed in his/her personnel file. The employee may request a conference to review this rating form with the appropriate administrator.

Rating Reports

Notification of rating of temporary professional employees shall be done in accordance with the provisions of Section 1108(a) of the School Code of 1949 as amended and the School District Policy governing the use of Appendix A of the Professional Evaluation Instrument.

B. Personnel File

Contents Available

An employee shall have the right, upon request, to review the contents of his/her personnel file. An employee shall be entitled to have a representative of the Association accompany him/her during such review.

No Separate File

The board agrees not to maintain or establish any separate personnel file which is not available for the employee's inspection.

PSEA

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Area Senior High School, which is part of the Crawford Central School District (District). The Grievant is represented in matters pertaining to collective bargaining by the Crawford District in August 1990. The Grievant began teaching in the District at the Cochranton Central Education Association (Association). The Grievant was initially hired by the where she taught Spanish. On June 10, 1994, the Grievant was given an unsatisfactory Area Schools, and she subsequently transferred to the Meadville Area Senior High School rating for the 1993-1994 school year by George Deshner, who is the High School Principal. The Grievant is a tenured foreign language instructor (Spanish) at the Meadville

The following events were testified to by Mr. Deshner as the principle reasons for

the unsatisfactory rating:

- reviewed. The Grievant admitted putting the student into the hallway until in class. A conference was held, and the Grievant's classroom rules were conference because her daughter received a detention notice for laughing she was ready to observe the classroom rules October 28, 1991 Parent Alice Williams requested a parent-teacher
- office who had also been put out of the Grievant's classroom. About this same time frame, other students were reporting to the
- am and leave at 3:20 pm. the office wearing her coat after 8:00 am. The faculty is to report by 7:50 about her reporting times at which point she became beligerent and argumentative. He recalls that the Grievant stated that she would not beginning at 8:11 am; on one occasion, she was not at the study hall at remain beyond 3:20 pm. On January 5, 1994, shortly efter the meeting, a December/late November Deshnar noticed the Grievant coming into Deshner testified that he called the Grievant into his office to talk The Grievant's first period is a study hall

P.07

letter was issued to the Grievant addressing her tardiness. provided in pertinent part that: That letter

萖 CLAUDETTE MITCHELL

GEORGE H. DESHNER

FROM: DATE 吊 TARDINESS TO SCHOOL

As you should recall, we had a discussion in early December about arriving to school on time. The normal workday for professional staff at Meadville Area Senior High School is 7:50 A.M. until 3:20 P.M. In order that the school day commence as it should, it is imperative that all staff be on time and at their assigned places at 7:50 A.M.

school on a consistent basis. Since this discussion, you have continued to arrive late to of your arrival are as follows: Some of the dates and times

Filed 06/26/2006

January 5, 1994	January 3, 1994	12		December 10, 1993	9	2	December 8 1993
6, 14 A, Ri.	5,07 A.SI.	0.00 A.M.	0,00	0.04	0,000 A.M.	M 4 20.0	7:56 A.M.

Attached please find the guidelines for A.M. hall supervision and the area to which you are assigned. Also attached is Board Policy No. 418 relating to tardiness. Please review these materials as they relate to this situation.

I anticipate that you will make every effort to correct the problem of tardiness and that it will not be necessary to take any other administrative action.

If you have any questions concerning this matter or wish to discuss it with me, please feel free to make an appointment

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

္ပ Mr. James C. LaScola, Superintendent

immediate action would have been taken. her class. He stated that had the Grievant produced the note in October,

On April 27, 1994, Deshner sent a letter to the Grievant summarizing the April 22, 1994 parent conference, together with a copy of the "note." That letter provided in pertinent part that:

To: Claudette Mitchell, MASH Spanish Teacher

From: George H. Deshner, Principal

RE: Parent Conference on 4/22/94

Date: 4/27/94

布拉布尔马尔布雷 有有 有不 不不 非 医自由性 有力者 医医 医甲状腺 医眼球 经未补偿 医性

Thank you for attending the parent conference with Mr. Curtis McBride and his son, Christopher, on April 22, 1994.

to us and ask that you make every effort to address these concerns and take appropriate action to correct them.) would like to review the concerns that Mr. McBride presented

(1) The timeliness of notifying parents that a problem exists with a student.

The date that the administration gives to submit progress reports is only a guideline. You may send a progress report at any time you see a student is falling off in their work. It is also advisable that parents be contacted by phone to apprise them of student progress or discipline situations.

(2) Offering appropriate suggestions to parents for improvement.

The progress report has many items that can be checked to offer suggestions for parents to help their students, to offer suggestions for parents to help their students to You may also offer any written comments to parents to help the parent and student. It is important that you give professional advice concerning correcting the situation to the parents about their son/daughter's situation.

(3) Discussing student eltuations in front of the class or to other students.

Grievance No. 2-94-95

89:38

· DEC-16-2003

As we have previously discussed, it is not appropriate to go to other students or to say things in front of the class about another student's situation. An example was to begin discussing the letter Heath Strasser wrote and then handing it to Mr. McBride to read. You did not bring the letter to the attention of the administration, guidance or Heath's parents at the time it was confiscated in October. It should not be brought up for other parents to read.

(4) Make sure that all students have the required materials.

Mr. McBride was concerned that Chris had not received handouts in class and then on two occasions when he asked for them was told there were no more available or was ignored. Chris indicated that on two different days, this had happened to him concerning the current class assignment. This could be avoided by making extra copies of worksheets and keeping them with you for the duration of the class periods the students are working on them.

(5) Use of films in class.

During the conterence the question arose concerning the use of the films El Norte and Naked Gun 2 1/2 in class. Chris indicated you had shown both to the class. You had indicated that you had not used this film but instead, Naked Gun. Chris reiterated that El Norte was shown to the class. It was established that in either situation the language used in the films is not appropriate. I would suggest that better judgment be used in selecting materials for use to teach Spanish. There are other films available in Spanish that do not use offensive language or sexual innuendos.

(6) Use of the work folders for ten percent of the students final grade.

At the conference you indicated that students were to keep all of their work from the year in a folder. This folder would be collected at the end of the year end would count for ten percent of their final grade. This came as a surprise to the students, parents and myself. We have had several discussions concerning the tolders over the past several weeks and at no time was this ever stated. As per our conference of 4/27/94 at 9:45 a.m., I am

定0~16~2883

09:30

suggesting that this not be used this current school year. If the folders are to be collected, they should be used as extra credit for the student and not a part of their final grade for this year. Students and parents should be notified of this requirement in writing at the start of the school year. You agreed to going this. Please inform those classes where this was to be used and of how it will be handled for this year.

cc: Mr. James C. LaScola, Superintendent Personnet File

(NOTE:)

Speakin' Spanish just ain't my game.
Cold cockin bi***es is my claim to fame;
Mother f***ers trying' to sweat me, but she [illegible]
Mother f***ers trying' to sweat me, but she [illegible]
Punk f***ers can never get [illegible] me.
So me and my [illegible] hang.
Trying to figure out the Mitchell gang bang.
Yeah, oh yeah, that sh**s just too hot, only
3 o'clock and already given up the cock,
Yes, she's much too fast, all I [illegible] can think
of is stickin' that Latino ass III

Ho! Ho! Yo! Yo! Yo!

15) Deshner testified that in May of 1994, a delegation of students came to him from the Spanish I class. They complained that the AM class was the two classes and found that the AM class had a higher percentage of A while the afternoon class did not. Deshner checked the grade average of the Grievant responded that the AM class was weaker and needed the help recalls that when he asked the Grievant about why this had been permitted, permitted to use cheat sheets on the test while they were not. Deshner

<u>6</u> classes and simply handed out xerox work sheets Deshner stated that in April the Grievant stopped talking to her

On June 10, 1994, at the conclusion of the school year, Deshner issued an

unsatisfactory rating to the Grievant. Of the eleven categories to be evaluated, five were

Grievance No. 2-84-95

"unsatisfactory". marked as "unsatisfactory" and six were marked as "satisfactory". The overall rating was

being without just cause. The District challenged the grievance, arguing that teacher Award stating that a May 20, 1992 Award by Arbitrator William C. Heekin, who found that dispute and that the instant dispute was arbitrable. As such, the matter is now ready to unsatisfactory ratings were arbitrable, was indeed controlling in the instant procedural ratings was not an arbitrable matter. On January 11, 1995, the undersigned issued an be decided on its merits On June 27, 1994, the instant grievance was filed protesting the evaluation as

CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

DISTRICT CONTENTIONS

(1971) and Travis v. Teeter, Pa. 326 87 A. 2d 177 (1952). The District argues that the Court decision in Nicolella v. Trinity Area School Board, 444 Pa. 544, 281 A. 2d 832 performance and it is not disciplinary in nature. It points to a Pennsylvania Supreme legal requirements, the rating is presumed to be valid and will be set eside only if the courts have held that if an unsatisfactory rating has been issued in compliance with all employee can prove that the rating is arbitrary or capricious or was issued in bad faith. It submits that this conclusion was reached applying the rule that where the law has The District contends that the purpose of the evaluation is to improve job

of discretion unless discretion is arbitrarily and fraudulently exercised or is based on a vested discretion in a public official, the courts will not interfere with the official's exercise mistake of law. The District maintains that the evidence presented in the hearing is fair and reasonable and was not arbitrary or capricious

, DEC-16-2803

09:31

PSEA

814 734 5286

P. 15

hearing with looser standards on the admissibility of hearsay evidence and that an hearsay evidence was presented. However, it takes the position that this is an arbitration unsatisfactory rating grievance is not a proceeding before an administrative agency; therefore, looser standards should apply Turning to the Association's several hearsay objections, the District admits that

employee's performance evaluation. It contends that such records were introduced into 3rd 147, 172 (1977), which discusses and defines an anecdotal record as it applies to an evidence on this record establishing specific dates and times of parent conferences and such records. The District concludes that the Grievant's evaluation for the 1993-94 school administrative directives to the Grievant. Conversely, it charges that the Grievant had no year is proper and should not be disturbed The District cites Augustine v. the Turkekytoot Valley Area School District, 9D&C

ASSOCIATION CONTENTIONS

of the Grievant cannot stand inasmuch as the District rated her unsatisfactory more than the minimum standards of the just cause provision. It also contends that the evaluation two months after her last observation. The Association maintains that this is a violation The Association contends that the District has not met its burden of proof under

Grievance No. 2-94-95

PSEA

814 734 5286

P.16

and that the District took no action to remediate any problems that were indicated. It the Grievant's prior observations gave no indication of the unsatisfactory rating to come of the Pennsylvania Schoot Code at paragraph 351.22 (g) and 351.24 (d). It argues that where improvement was needed; and it points out that the recommendations given satisfactory ratings and that the March 25, 1994 observation report contained six areas points to the fact that the September 16, 1993 observation report contained only concentrated on seating and nothing of substance. The Association concludes that the observation reports do not give notice of a possible unsatisfactory rating

objected to throughout the record. It concludes that the hearsay statements relied upon statements made by others. The Association notes that this hearsay testimony was inadmissible hearsay. It submits that Deshner's testimony is what he did in reaction to of lateness, the Association maintains that the Grievant did not know that she had missed cannot form the basis for the Grievant's unsatisfactory rating. Turning to the allegation the District's characterization admitting only that the Grievant said, "I'm not a PMS and did not expect to have one in the current year. As to the PMS statement, it denies traveling teacher, the Grievant did not have a hail duty assignment in the previous year any hall duty assignments until she received the January 5 memo. It argues that as a unsatisfactory rating given to the Grievant was not for just cause and that it was arbitrary the Grievant discussed student situations with other students. position that the ratings on the form are not valid because the District falled to prove that teacher," when a student said that she was in a bad mood. The Association takes the The Association also contends that the District's case is based almost entirely on It asserts that the

25:68

and capricious. The Association seeks in relief that all references to the unsatisfactory

rating be removed from the Grievant's personnel file.

DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS

District's witnesses. In this connection, the District argues that inasmuch as this matter contractual right or a management right is on the line, the "truth of the matter asserted" to operate under somewhat relaxed rules of evidence, when an employee's job, administrative agency, "looser standards" should apply. While arbitration hearings tend cannot be established from hearsay testimony. Black's Law Dictionary, Fitth Edition, in pertinent part describes hearsay evidence as The presentation of this case involved considerable hearsay testimony from the an unsatisfactory rating grievance and is not a proceeding before an

Evidence not proceeding from the personal knowledge of the witness, but from the mere repetition of what he has hear others

be accepted as background only. Hearsay evidence will not be accepted where it is offered for the purpose of proving the truth of the matter asserted. Therefore, for the purposes of this decision, hearsay evidence offered as background will

red flag would certainly go up on the principal's mind that a potential problem might exist When students approach a principal with ongoing complaints about a teacher, a

P. 18

· IEC-16-2803

89:32

matter. The evidence placed on this record expressly establishes that the students with with the teacher. Indeed, the principal would be remiss if he failed to investigate the It must be observed as significant that no evidence was adduced on this record that whom the Grievant was having trouble were all from her eighth period Spanish I class. fact that she had a problem with one of her six Spanish classes classes. It must follow then, that the Grievant's unsatisfactory evaluation is based on the might tend to indicate that any problem existed in any of the other of the Grievant's

English teacher, described them as "discipline problems." Indeed, even Principal Deshner the Grievant. admitted under cross-examination that it was possible that these students were out to get have been mirrored in her other classes to teach in a satisfactory manner, as set forth in the unsatisfactory evaluation, would not charges and allegations against the Grievant, District witness Richard Curry, an In describing the principle students from the eighth period class who were bringing It simply strains the bounds of logic to accept that the Grievant's inability

of the District's allegations against the Grievant were expressed in hearsay testimony by without having any first hand knowledge that what the students said had actually Principal Deshner. accusations brought to him by the students of the eighth period Spanish I class. This is not the kind of evidence that can be relied upon in order to prove the truth of the matter With the exception of a few charges that will be discussed later in this Award, most Simply put, he accepted and later raised in charges against the Grievant the More specifically, he was repeating what the students said to him

Grievance No. 2-94-95

P. 19

1KC-16-2003

25:68

asserted. As such, that testimony by Deshner that is not of his first hand knowledge or an admission by the Grievant on this record will not be considered

contractually mandated starting time. While the Grievant offered several excuses, the to teachers at the beginning of the year. The Grievant is responsible for this material, record establishes that the schedule information was included in the material handed out teaching schedules. This charge against the Grievant is affirmed, and the letter reflecting particularly in the face of the fact that she was not a new teacher who was unaware of the same shall remain in her file. It must be noted that upon receipt of this letter, the Grievant reported in a timely fashion. The record reveals that the Grievant did on several occasions report after the

affirmed by her own testimony and that of District witness Curry. It must be observed as it took a student/parent complaint to make an issue of it curious that while the Grievant wore this outfit all day, including trips into the office, that The charge that the Grievant wore a bra over her sweater on "inside out day" is

pole or post in the classroom is set aside by the Grievant's uncontroverted testimony that she let the students choose their own seats The charge that the Grievant retaliated against a student by placing him behind a

substitute who showed the film El Norte. However, the record reveals that the Grievant did show the movie Naked Gun to her classes. It is not clear from this record what part the showing of this movie played in her unsatisfactory evaluation. There is no evidence to support the allegation that it was the Grievant and not a

Grievance No. 2-94-95

Š

10 (000

67-40

į

ç Ş

. . .

class that she "is not a PMS teacher" is well tounded and hardly professional The District is correct in its concern about the Grievant's admitted statement to her

of D as a grade or a discipline note was not sufficiently developed as a charge and is accordingly dismissed. The question as to the Grievant's grades in the eighth period class and the use

that students of her eighth period class had raised with Principal Deshner. This was that the Grievant's response was to hand out a survey dealing with the express charges matter with her students and to start on Monday with something new. The record reveals directly opposite to what she had been instructed On March 25, 1994, Superintendent LaScola told the Grievant to move on from the

in sum, once the hearsay testimony is removed, the charges affirmed against the

- During several fate reports. Upon b Grievant corrected this problem. November/December Upon being reprimanded, 늉 Grievant did have
- $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ The Grievant wore a bra over her sweater on inside out
- $\underline{\omega}$ The Grievant did show the movie Naked Gun
- ٩ a list of seventy-one classroom expressions The Grievant did publish one questionable expression in

IEC-16-2003

Ø9: 44

h the way of commendations, Deshner provided:

- Students are encouraged to speak Spanish at all times -Good.
- Ŋ Teacher walked about room and checked student

unsatisfactory evaluation. Nor do they forecast in any fashion that the Grievant was in It must be observed as significant that these observations are not indicative trouble. It must be observed as critical to the District's case that when he was asked about the end of the year evaluation for the 1993-1994 school year of the Grievant, hearsay that is excluded from this record. Indeed, the very anecdotal records relied upon Deshner replied that it was "based on student interviews," by Deshner were also for the greatest extent hearsay. This is the same type of

unsatisfactory evaluation was based primarily upon hearsay provided by students to the show errors of judgement as set forth, supra, the record here clearly reveals that the overturned by a third party unless it is arbitrary or capricious. While the Grievant did the other five of her six classes. The record reveals that the problems disclosed by Principal. At the same time, there is no evidence that the Grievant had a problem with students and eventually their parents came from the eighth period class. Other than the suggestions by the administration to the Grievant in resolving the problems with this parent/teacher conferences, there are no warnings of poor teaching practice or Evaluation of a teacher is at best a subjective process that should not be readily

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

August 3, 1995

PSE9

814 734 5286

together, it must be found that this evaluation was arbitrary and capricious. Accordingly, lails far short of professional assistance. dass. The admonition by Superintendent LaScola to "start Monday with something new" When all of these factors are considered

the grievance is sustained

The grievance is sustained. The June 10, 1994 evaluation of the Grievant for the 1993-1994 school year is overturned and any reference thereto shall be removed from the Grievant's file.

Carl F. Stoltenberg

8

Grievance No. 2-94-95